

Avoiding the Price of Adaptivity: Inference in Linear Contextual Bandits via Stability

Samya Prahara[‡], Koulik Khamaru[‡]

[‡] Department of Statistics, Rutgers University

December 24, 2025

Abstract

Statistical inference in contextual bandits is complicated by the adaptive, non-i.i.d. nature of the data. A growing body of work has shown that classical least-squares inference may fail under adaptive sampling, and that constructing valid confidence intervals for linear functionals of the model parameter typically requires paying an unavoidable inflation of order $\sqrt{d \log T}$. This phenomenon—often referred to as the *price of adaptivity*—highlights the inherent difficulty of reliable inference under general contextual bandit policies.

A key structural property that circumvents this limitation is the *stability* condition of Lai and Wei (Lai and Wei, 1982), which requires the empirical feature covariance to concentrate around a deterministic limit. When stability holds, the ordinary least-squares estimator satisfies a central limit theorem, and classical Wald-type confidence intervals—designed for i.i.d. data—become asymptotically valid even under adaptation, *without* incurring the $\sqrt{d \log T}$ price of adaptivity.

In this paper, we propose and analyze a penalized EXP4 algorithm for linear contextual bandits. Our first main result shows that this procedure satisfies the Lai–Wei stability condition and therefore admits valid Wald-type confidence intervals for linear functionals. Our second result establishes that the same algorithm achieves regret guarantees that are minimax optimal up to logarithmic factors, demonstrating that stability and statistical efficiency can coexist within a single contextual bandit method. Finally, we complement our theory with simulations illustrating the empirical normality of the resulting estimators and the sharpness of the corresponding confidence intervals.

1 Introduction

Statistical inference under adaptive data collection has become a central challenge in modern learning systems. Unlike classical settings where data are sampled independently of past observations, adaptive algorithms—such as contextual bandits and reinforcement learning policies—select actions based on previously observed losses. This feedback loop creates intricate dependencies that distort the distribution of both covariates and errors, often rendering standard inferential tools invalid.

Even when estimators remain consistent, their asymptotic distributions can deviate substantially from classical theory, complicating uncertainty quantification and hypothesis testing (Dickey and Fuller, 1979; Lai and Wei, 1982; Zhang et al., 2020; Deshpande et al., 2023; Khamaru et al., 2021).

A recurring theme in recent work is that valid inference is possible using when the data-collection rule exhibits sufficient regularity or *stability*. At a high level, a bandit algorithm is *stable* if the long-run behavior of the algorithm settles into a predictable pattern, despite ongoing adaptation. When such structure exists, it becomes possible to characterize limiting distributions of estimators, derive confidence sets, and recover analogs of the classical central limit theorem (Lai and Wei, 1982). Recent works have demonstrated that this property is satisfied for the Upper Confidence Bound-type of algorithms (Kalvit and Zeevi, 2021; Fan and Glynn, 2022; Khamaru and Zhang, 2024; Han et al., 2024), and a variant of the Thompson Sampling (Halder et al., 2025; Fan and Glynn, 2022). Recent work of Fan et al. (2025) show that the LinUCB (Li et al., 2010; Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011) algorithm also satisfy this stability condition for linear contextual bandit problem.

In this paper, we investigate stability properties of bandit algorithms for a linear contextual bandit problem. Formally, at each round t , the learner observes a context $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and selects an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ based on past data and context x_t . Concretely, let $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} := \sigma(x_1, a_1, \ell_1, \dots, x_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, \ell_{t-1})$ denote the sigma-field generated by the observations up to time $t-1$, then a_t depends on \mathcal{F}_{t-1} and x_t . Upon selecting an action a_t we incur a loss according to a linear model:

$$\ell_t = \langle \phi(a_t, x_t), \beta^* \rangle + \varepsilon_t, \quad (1)$$

where $\phi : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a known feature map and $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an unknown parameter to be learned. We assume that the noise sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, x_t] = 0$. Our goal is to construct confidence intervals for linear functional of the form $a^\top \beta^*$, for any fixed vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

1.1 Price of Adaptivity:

Before we dive into more details, it is useful to compare the available method for constructing confidence intervals for $a^\top \beta^*$. One popular approach of constructing confidence intervals for $a^\top \beta^*$ is to use martingale concentration inequalities (de la Pena et al., 2004; De la Pena et al., 2009). Formally, let $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda, T}$ denote the ridge-estimator with regularizer λ based on data up to time T . Let

$$\mathbf{V}_T = \lambda I_d + \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(a_t, x_t) \phi(a_t, x_t)^\top$$

be the regularized design matrix. Given a target confidence $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, a widely used approach, originating from the work of Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011), is to construct a confidence interval

$$\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{APS}}(a) := \left[a^\top \hat{\beta}_{\lambda, T} \pm R_T \sqrt{a^\top \mathbf{V}_T^{-1} a} \right]. \quad (2)$$

Assuming $\|\beta^*\|_2 \leq S$, $\|\phi(x, a)\|_2 \leq L$ and noise ε_t is 1 sub-Gaussian, the factor R_T takes the following form

$$R_T = \sqrt{d \log\left(\frac{TL}{\lambda}\right) + \log(1/\alpha)} + \sqrt{\lambda} S. \quad (3)$$

It is useful to compare the confidence interval (2) with a Wald-type interval, which is asymptotically exact when the data $(x_t, a_t) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{P}$:

$$\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a) := \left[a^\top \hat{\beta}_{\text{OLS}} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{a^\top S_T^{-1} a} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{\text{OLS}}$ is the least square estimator, $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the standard normal quantile and $\hat{\sigma}$ is a consistent estimator of noise variance σ . Comparing the length of the two confidence intervals from (2) and (4), we observe ¹

$$\frac{\text{width}(\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{APS}}(a))}{\text{width}(\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a))} \approx \sqrt{d \log T}, \quad (5)$$

Put simply, for contextual bandit problems the confidence intervals are $\sqrt{d \log T}$ times wider.

It is natural to ask whether one might construct any other confidence interval based on some other estimator. A recent line of work by Lattimore (2023); Khamaru et al. (2021); Vakili et al. (2021) show that this enlargement in the confidence interval length by a factor of $\sqrt{d \log T}$ is necessary when $d \geq 2$. State differently, this enlargement in confidence interval for contextual bandit is unavoidable in a worst case sense.

1.2 Validity of Wald’s Interval via Stability:

The comparison above highlights the *price of adaptivity*: without further structure, any confidence interval for $a^\top \beta^*$ must inflate by a factor of order $\sqrt{d \log T}$, reflecting the *worst-case* distortions introduced by adaptive sampling. A natural question is whether this inflation is intrinsic to all adaptive procedures, or whether additional regularity in the data-collection rule can restore the validity of classical Wald’s confidence interval (4).

Following the seminal work of Lai and Wei (1982), this regularity can be formalized through the notion of *stability*.

Definition 1. We call a bandit algorithm \mathcal{A} stable if there exists a sequence of non-random positive definite matrix $\{\Sigma_T^*\}$ such that

$$\Sigma_T^{*-1} S_T \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{I} \quad (6)$$

Theorem 3 of Lai and Wei (1982) ensures that if a bandit algorithm \mathcal{A} is stable, then the least square estimator $\hat{\beta}_{\text{OLS}}$ is asymptotically normal:

$$\frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}} \cdot S_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{\beta}_{\text{OLS}} - \beta^* \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}$ is a consistent estimator ² for noise standard deviation σ . An immediate consequence of the above using Slutsky’s theorem is that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a) \ni a^\top \beta^* \right) = 1 - \alpha.$$

¹One usually takes λ to be small and the effect of the term $\lambda \sqrt{S}$ in (3) is negligible.

²For instance, one might use the estimator from (Lai and Wei, 1982, Lemma 3).

In other words, Wald’s confidence interval for $a^\top \beta^*$ is valid as long as the underlying bandit algorithm \mathcal{A} is stable, and we do not pay the $\sqrt{d \log T}$ *price of adaptivity*. Our goal in this paper is to propose and analyze an algorithm which is simultaneously stable and provide good regret.

1.3 Contributions

In this paper, we study the problem of constructing confidence intervals for linear functionals of the model parameters in a linear contextual bandit problem. Section 2 provides a detailed description of the contextual bandit framework we consider, while Section 3 introduces the algorithm we analyze. The procedure, stated formally in Algorithm 3.1, is a penalized variant of the classical EXP4 algorithm designed to enforce stability while allowing adaptive exploration. Our first main result, stated in Theorem 1, establishes that the penalized EXP4 algorithm is stable in the sense of Lai and Wei (1982) (see definition (1)), enabling the construction of asymptotically valid Wald-type confidence intervals. Our second result, detailed in Theorem 2, analyzes the regret of the proposed algorithm. We show that, despite being explicitly designed for inferential stability, the procedure simultaneously achieves minimax-optimal regret guarantees up to logarithmic factors. Thus, stability and statistical efficiency can coexist within a single contextual bandit algorithm. Section 6 contains proofs of our main theorems with some technical details deferred to the Appendix. Finally, in Section 5, we complement our theoretical findings with numerical experiments demonstrating the empirical validity of the Wald confidence intervals produced by Algorithm 3.1.

1.4 Related Work

The challenges of performing statistical inference under adaptive data collection have been well documented in recent years. Because adaptive policies bias the distribution of covariates and errors, classical inferential procedures may become invalid. This breakdown has been observed empirically (Xu et al. (2013); Villar et al. (2015)) and supported by theoretical analyses (Nie et al. (2018); Shin et al. (2019, 2021)). To counteract these issues, several methodological approaches have been proposed, including online debiasing techniques (Khamaru et al. (2021); Chen et al. (2022); Kim et al. (2023)) and procedures based on inverse propensity scores (Hadad et al. (2021); Deshpande et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2022); Nair and Janson (2023); Leiner et al. (2025)). These methods address inference in adaptive environments more broadly, but do not directly resolve the structural constraints that give rise to the $\sqrt{d \log T}$ “price of adaptivity” in contextual bandits.

A distinct line of work focuses on identifying conditions under which classical, Wald-type asymptotic inference is restored despite adaptivity. The seminal paper of Lai and Wei (1982) introduced the notion of *stability*, showing that if the empirical design covariance converges to a deterministic limit, then least-squares estimators satisfy a central limit theorem and Wald confidence intervals regain asymptotic validity. This perspective has motivated a growing literature on stability-based inference for bandit algorithms (Kalvit and Zeevi (2021); Khamaru and Zhang (2024); Fan and Glynn (2022); Fan et al. (2024); Han et al. (2024); Halder et al. (2025); Fan et al. (2025)). However, subsequent work has shown that many commonly used bandit algorithms fail to satisfy the Lai–Wei stability condition, leading to substantial under-coverage when Wald intervals

are applied naively (Fan et al. (2024); Praharaj and Khamaru (2025)). This underscores the central question motivating our work: *can one design adaptive algorithms that are simultaneously stable and statistically efficient?*

Contextual and adversarial bandit algorithms are frequently derived from mirror descent (Latimore and Szepesvári (2020)), a framework that has been applied extensively in online optimization (Abernethy et al. (2009); Audibert et al. (2014); Bubeck et al. (2018); Wei and Luo (2018)) and that underlies widely used adversarial bandit methods such as EXP3 (Auer et al. (1995)), EXP4 (Auer et al. (2002)), Tsallis-INF (Zimmert and Seldin (2021); Masoudian and Seldin (2021)), and OFTRL (Ito (2021)). Despite their strong regret guarantees, the stability properties of these algorithms are not well understood, and existing analyses suggest that many of them may not support valid Wald-type inference.

Finally, an alternative approach to inference in adaptive settings relies on non-asymptotic, anytime-valid confidence intervals constructed via concentration inequalities for self-normalized martingales. This line of work builds on the foundational results of de la Peña et al. (de la Peña et al. (2004); De la Peña et al. (2009)) and includes several refined analyses (Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011); Howard et al. (2020); Waudby-Smith et al. (2024)). These intervals hold uniformly over time and do not rely on asymptotic arguments, but the price paid is typically much wider confidence intervals compared to those achievable under stability, reflecting the worst-case nature of anytime-valid guarantees.

1.5 Notation

For any matrix A , let $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$ and $\|A\|_F$ denote the operator norm and the Frobenius norm, respectively. For any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the standard ℓ_p -norm for $p \in (0, \infty)$ is denoted by $\|v\|_p$. For a real-valued random variable u , we define $\|u\|_p := \mathbb{E}[|u|^p]^{1/p}$. Given a fixed weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define a weighted norm on \mathbb{R}^d , denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$, as $\|v\|_{w,*}^2 := \sum_{i=1}^d w_i v_i^2$, where $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For two nonnegative sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we write $b_n \gg a_n$ if $\frac{b_n}{a_n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Throughout, we suppress absolute constants in inequalities by using the notation \lesssim and \gtrsim . The Loewner partial order on symmetric matrices is denoted by \preceq .

2 Problem Setup

We consider a linear contextual bandit problem with a finite action set \mathcal{A} . At each round $t = 1, \dots, T$, the learner observes a context vector $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, drawn i.i.d. from a distribution $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}$, selects an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$, and receives a random loss

$$\ell_t = \langle \beta^*, c(x_t, a_t) \rangle + \varepsilon_t, \quad (8)$$

where $c(x_t, a_t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a known feature representation of the pair (x_t, a_t) , and $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an unknown parameter vector. We use $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(x_1, a_1, \ell_1, \dots, x_t, a_t, \ell_t)$ to denote the σ -field generated by observations up to time t . We assume that the noise sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=1}^T$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, x_t] = 0. \quad (9)$$

At each round, the learner chooses an action by sampling from a *mixture of K base experts* $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K\}$, where each $\pi_k(\cdot \mid x_t)$ defines an arbitrary (possibly stochastic) policy mapping the context x_t to a distribution over actions. The learner maintains mixture weights $w_t = (w_{t,1}, \dots, w_{t,K})$ belonging to the ε -simplex

$$\Delta_\varepsilon = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^K : \sum_{k=1}^K w_k = 1, w_k \geq \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (10)$$

We take ε to be a *small* positive tuning parameter that decays with the number of rounds T . Introduction of the tuning parameter ε guarantees $w_k \geq \varepsilon$ and consequently ensures that various importance ratio based estimators used in our algorithm are always well-defined.

The effective policy at round t is therefore the convex mixture

$$Q_t(a \mid x_t) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \pi_k(a \mid x_t). \quad (11)$$

The learner then draws an action $a_t \sim Q_t(\cdot \mid x_t)$ and observes the corresponding stochastic loss ℓ_t . Throughout, we work under the following assumptions:

Assumption A.

(A1) $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, x_t] = 0$, $|\varepsilon_t| \leq 1$, and $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, x_t, a_t] = \sigma^2$ for all $t \geq 1$.

(A2) The feature vector and the unknown parameter satisfy

$$\|\beta^*\|_2 \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|c(x, a)\|_2 \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } (x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

(A3) The context vectors $(x_t)_{t \geq 1}$ are drawn i.i.d. from a distribution $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and for every expert $k \in [K]$

$$\lambda_{\min} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_k(a \mid x) \cdot c(x, a) c(x, a)^\top \right) \right\} \geq \lambda^* > 0. \quad (12)$$

(A4) Assume that $\sup_{k \in [K]} \{\inf_{a, x} \pi_k(a \mid x)\} > 0$.

Assumption (A1) states that the noise sequence is conditionally zero mean, bounded and homoscedastic. Assumption (A2) imposes a boundedness assumption on the parameter vector β^* and feature map $c(\cdot, \cdot)$. Assumptions (A1) and (A2) together ensure that the observed loss $\{\ell_t\}$ is uniformly bounded. Assumption (A3) posits that the context vectors $\{x_t\}$ are i.i.d., and that the weighted covariance matrix associated with each expert is non-singular. Assumption (A4) can always be satisfied by taking one of the expert is as a uniform expert $\pi_{\text{unif}}(a \mid x) = 1/|\mathcal{A}|$ for all action $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and context $x \in \mathcal{X}$. This assumption along with our choice of weights $w_{tk} \geq \varepsilon > 0$ (see equation (10)) ensures that $Q_t(a_t \mid x_t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 1$ and various importance weight based estimators are well-defined.

2.1 Linearity of loss in w

Let Δ_K be the simplex in K dimension. At each round t , the learner maintains mixture weights $w_t \in \Delta_K$ over a fixed set of base policies $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K$. The executed policy is the convex combination

$$Q_t(a | x_t) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \pi_k(a | x_t). \quad (13)$$

This mixture induces both the sampling distribution of actions and the expected loss of the algorithm. The loss incurred at time t is a function of both context x_t and action a_t , due to which in the following discussion we rewrite l_t as $l_t(a_t, x_t)$. Now, at round t , any expectation under Q_t is a convex combination of the expectations under the individual experts $\{\pi_k\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{a \sim Q_t}[l_t] = \sum_a \left(\sum_k w_{t,k} \pi_k(a | x_t) \right) r(a, x_t) = \sum_k w_{t,k} \underbrace{\sum_a \pi_k(a | x_t) \mathbb{E}[l(a, x_t) | x_t]}_{\text{expected loss of expert } k}. \quad (14)$$

$$\equiv \langle w_t, g^*(x_t) \rangle \quad (15)$$

Hence, the expected loss is *linear in w_t* . Since the per-round loss $g^*(x_t)$ depends on the context, we define the *global* (context-averaged) *loss vector*

$$\bar{g}^* := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_X}[g^*(x)] = \left(\mathbb{E}_x \left[\sum_a l(a, x) \pi_k(a | x) \right] \right)_{k=1}^K. \quad (16)$$

2.2 Unbiased estimate of $g^*(x_t)$

Although only one action a_t is observed, the importance-weighted estimator for expert k ,

$$\hat{g}_{t,k} = \ell_t \frac{\pi_k(a_t | x_t)}{Q_t(a_t | x_t)}, \quad (17)$$

is an unbiased estimator of the per-expert loss $g_k^*(x_t) = \sum_a l(a, x_t) \pi_k(a | x_t)$. Taking expectation over $a_t \sim Q_t(\cdot | x_t)$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_{t,k} | x_t] = \sum_a \mathbb{E}[l(a, x_t) | x_t] Q_t(a | x_t) \frac{\pi_k(a | x_t)}{Q_t(a | x_t)} = g_k^*(x_t). \quad (18)$$

2.3 Regret

We measure the regret of our policy with respect to optimal mixture:

$$w^* := \arg \min_{w \in \Delta_K} \langle \bar{g}^*, w \rangle$$

The cumulative regret after T rounds is defined as

$$\text{Reg}(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \{ \langle g^*(x_t), w_t - w^* \rangle \}. \quad (19)$$

All expectations are taken with respect to the learner's internal randomness and the stochastic loss environment as well as the random context x_t .

3 A Penalized Exp4 Algorithm

In this section we describe our algorithm. Recall that at round t , the effective policy executed by the learner is the convex mixture

$$Q_t(a \mid x_t) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \pi_k(a \mid x_t), \quad (20)$$

where each $\pi_k(a \mid x_t)$ is an arbitrary base policy that maps the context x_t to a distribution over actions. Upon taking an action $a_t \sim Q_t(\cdot \mid x_t)$, the learner receives a stochastic loss ℓ_t . To evaluate the experts, our algorithm — stated in Algorithm 3 — constructs the standard importance-weighted gradient estimator

$$\hat{g}_{t,k} = \ell_t \frac{\pi_k(a_t \mid x_t)}{Q_t(a_t \mid x_t)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (21)$$

The weight vector w_t is then updated via a composite mirror-descent [Duchi et al. \(2011\)](#) step with the entropy-induced mirror map $\phi(\cdot)$, and an entropy-induced penalty $R(\cdot)$:

$$\phi(w) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \log w_k - w_k \quad \text{and} \quad R(w) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k (\log w_k + \log(1/\epsilon) - 1) \quad (22)$$

Formally, our Algorithm 3.1 minimizes the following loss in an online fashion via a mirror descent-style algorithm:

$$\min_{w \in \Delta_\epsilon} \{ \langle \bar{g}^*, w \rangle + \lambda R(w) \}. \quad (23)$$

The regularization term $\lambda R(w)$ introduces a mild curvature to the otherwise linear objective $\langle \bar{g}^*, w \rangle$, ensuring better-behaved updates. The parameter λ is chosen to be small so that the solution to the modified problem (23) achieves low regret with respect to the natural linear loss $\langle \bar{g}^*, w \rangle$. In addition, the constraint set Δ_ϵ guarantees that the gradients of the loss (23) remain *well-behaved*.

Algorithm 3.1 Penalized EXP4

- 1: **Input:** Base policies $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K$, stepsizes $\{\eta\}$, penalty $\lambda > 0$, floor $\epsilon \in (0, 1/K]$.
- 2: Initialize weights $w_{1,k} = 1/K$ for all k , and set $c_R = \log(1/\epsilon)$
- 3: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
- 4: Observe context x_t
- 5: Form mixture $Q_t(a \mid x_t) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \pi_k(a \mid x_t)$
- 6: Sample $a_t \sim Q_t(\cdot \mid x_t)$ and observe loss ℓ_t
- 7: Compute estimates $\hat{g}_{t,k} = \ell_t \pi_k(a_t \mid x_t) / Q_t(a_t \mid x_t)$
- 8: Update intermediate weights

$$w_{t+1,k}^+ = w_{t,k} \exp\left(-\eta \hat{g}_{t,k} - \lambda([\nabla R(w_t)]_k + c_R)\right)$$

- 9: Update $w_{t+1} = \arg \min_{w \in \Delta_\epsilon} \{D_\phi(w, w_{t+1}^+)\}$

10: **end for**

4 Main results

In this section we state our main results. Section 1.1 highlights that, for general adaptive data-collection rules, valid confidence intervals for linear functionals must inflate by a factor on the order of $\sqrt{d \log T}$. In this section, we show that the penalized EXP4 procedure (Algorithm 3.1) avoids this worst-case behavior. In particular, this algorithm satisfies the stability from Definition 1, which ensures the validity of Wald-type inference, and it does so while retaining near-minimax-optimal regret.

We begin with the stability and asymptotic normality of the ordinary least-squares estimator, and then establish regret guarantees.

4.1 Stability and a central limit theorem

A key component of our analysis is that the empirical average of the weight vectors $\{w_t\}$ converges to a fixed vector w_T^* :

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad k \in [K]. \quad (24)$$

A consequence of this convergence is that the Gram matrix $S_T := \sum_{t=1}^T c(x_t, a_t) c(x_t, a_t)^\top$ is asymptotically close to a deterministic limit Σ_T^* , where

$$\Sigma_T^* = T \sum_{k=1}^K w_{T,k}^* \Sigma_k \quad \text{with} \quad \Sigma_k := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_X} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_k(a | x) \cdot c(x, a) c(x, a)^\top \right) \quad (25)$$

Thus the stability condition (1) is satisfied. With this structural ingredient in place, we now state our quantitative central limit theorem.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A4), the penalized-EXP4 algorithm (3.1) with step size $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log K}{|A|T}}$, and tuning parameters $\epsilon = \frac{1}{KT}$, $\lambda = \frac{\gamma_T}{\sqrt{T}}$ with $\gamma_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $T/\log^2 T \gg \gamma_T$, is stable; we have*

$$\Sigma_T^{*-1} \cdot S_T \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{I}_d,$$

with Σ_T^* from (25). Consequently, for any fixed $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\frac{a^\top (\hat{\beta}_{\text{OLS}} - \beta^*)}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{a^\top S_T^{-1} a}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad (26a)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{\text{OLS}}$ is the least square estimate, and $\hat{\sigma}$ is any consistent estimator of noise standard deviation σ .

Throughout we assume that the sample covariance matrix S_T is invertible. If S_T is not invertible, one can construct a ridge estimator with the same guarantees. We highlight the technical details

in Section 6.1. A direct consequence of Theorem 1 is that the Wald confidence interval (4) is asymptotically exact: for any fixed $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(a^\top \beta^\star \in \mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a)\right) = 1 - \alpha.$$

Thus, stability ensures that the classical (nonadaptive) form of the Wald interval remains valid despite the adaptively collected data. See Section 6.1 for a proof of Theorem 1.

4.2 Regret guarantees

We next turn to regret guarantees. The following theorem quantifies how the choice of γ_T influences the regret, formalizing the tradeoff introduced by the stabilizing penalty.

Theorem 2. *Suppose Assumptions (A1)-(A4) are in force. Then, for $T \geq 4$, under the stepsize $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log K}{TK}}$ and tuning parameters $\epsilon = \frac{1}{KT}$ and $\lambda = \frac{\gamma_T}{\sqrt{T}}$, Algorithm 3.1 satisfies*

$$\text{Regret}(T) \leq 8\sqrt{TK \log K} + \gamma_T \log(KT)\sqrt{T} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log^3(KT)}{K^2\sqrt{T}}. \quad (27)$$

We prove Theorem 2 in Section 6.2. Setting $\gamma_T = \sqrt{\log T}$ yields regret of order $O\left(\sqrt{TK \log(KT)}\right)$, matching minimax lower bounds up to logarithmic factors. Thus, despite being explicitly regularized for inferential stability, the procedure retains the characteristic efficiency of the EXP4 family.

5 Experiments

We evaluate the empirical behavior of the proposed *penalized-EXP4* algorithm in a stochastic contextual bandit environment with linear loss structure. In this section we provide the simulation details for the standard OLS estimator. Experimental details for the ridge estimator are presented in Appendix B.

5.1 Simulation Environment

The loss model follows a block-sparse linear structure

$$\ell_t = \langle x_t, \theta_{a_t} \rangle + \varepsilon_t,$$

where $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{Unif}(-0.1, 0.1)$ and $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ is a normalized Gaussian context vector with $\|x_t\|_2 \leq 1$. Each arm $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ possesses an unknown parameter $\theta_a \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, and the global coefficient vector

$$\beta^\star = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_A) \in \mathbb{R}^{Ad_x}$$

is normalized to satisfy $\|\beta^\star\|_2 \leq 1$. The learner never observes θ_a ; instead, only bandit feedback ℓ_t is revealed.

We encode actions through a sparse block feature map

$$c(x, a) = (0, \dots, x, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{Ad_x},$$

Our experiments are conducted in two settings. The first assumes experts based on softmax policies, and the second replaces them with six layer neural network policies. We outline the specifics of each configuration in the following sections.

Simulation setting with softmax experts

Each expert network produces action probabilities through a softmax map:

$$\pi_k(a \mid x) = \frac{e^{\langle u_{a,k}, x \rangle}}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} e^{\langle u_{a,k}, x \rangle}}$$

where, $k \in [K]$ and the entries of the weight vector $u_{a,k}$ are i.i.d. draws from $\mathcal{N}(0, 12)$ distribution. In our experiments we set $A = K = 5$ and $d_x = 10$.

Simulation setting with neural experts

Unlike the previous setting, the experts now form neural policies with a six-layer ReLU architecture. The expert policy is a six-layer neural network given by

$$x \longrightarrow h_1 \longrightarrow h_2 \longrightarrow h_3 \longrightarrow h_4 \longrightarrow h_5 \longrightarrow h_6 \longrightarrow \text{softmax}(\text{logits}),$$

where the hidden layers satisfy

$$h_i = \text{ReLU}(W_i h_{i-1} + b_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, 6,$$

with $h_0 = x$. The entries of the weight matrices W_i are i.i.d. draws from a standard Gaussian random variable. The resulting expert policy is

$$\pi(a \mid x) = \frac{\exp(\text{logits}_a)}{\sum_{a'=1}^A \exp(\text{logits}_{a'})}.$$

In our experiments we set $A = 3$ and $K = 5$ and $d_x = 50$.

5.2 Algorithmic Configuration

Let $z_t = c(x_t, a_t)$. At the end of horizon T , we compute the OLS estimator

$$\hat{\beta}_T = S_T^{-1} b_T, \quad S_T = \sum_{t=1}^T z_t z_t^\top, \quad b_T = \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \ell_t.$$

Hyperparameters for Algorithm 3 are set to be

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{KT}, \quad \lambda_{\text{pen}} = \frac{\sqrt{\log T}}{\sqrt{T}}, \quad \eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log K}{|\mathcal{A}|T}},$$

unless stated otherwise. We draw a random unit direction $a \in \mathbb{R}^{Ad_x}$ and for each confidence level $\alpha \in [0.20, 0.01]$, check whether the true parameter lies inside the interval. Concretely we check if the target parameter $a^\top \beta^*$ lies in the interval

$$\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{APS}}(a) := [a^\top \hat{\beta}_{\text{ridge}} - R_T \sqrt{a^\top \mathbf{V}_T^{-1} a}, a^\top \hat{\beta}_{\text{ridge}} + R_T \sqrt{a^\top \mathbf{V}_T^{-1} a}],$$

where R_T is from (3) with $S = 1$. Wald coverage is measured analogously using the confidence interval $\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a)$ from (4), with $\hat{\sigma}$ as the sample standard deviation estimate (Lai and Wei, 1982, Lemma 3). For each $T \in \{500, 3000\}$, we report empirical coverage of $\mathcal{I}^{\text{APS}}(a)$ vs $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}(a)$, and their average width.

5.3 Simulation Plots

To quantify inferential quality we compute, over $N_{\text{runs}} = 1200$ Monte Carlo trials, the empirical coverage and interval width of confidence intervals produced by our method and a Wald-type baseline.

Softmax Experts

We vary the horizon and confidence level:

$$T \in \{500, 3000\}, \quad A = K = 5, \quad d_x = 10,$$




Figure 1: **Left:** Coverages of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. **Right:** Expected confidence width of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. Simulations are based on $T = 500$ runs.




Figure 2: **Left:** Coverages of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. **Right:** Expected confidence width of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. Simulations are based on $T = 3000$ runs.




Figure 3: **Left:** Histogram of the standardized OLS estimator for the Softmax Experts with $T = 500$. **Right:** Histogram of the standardized OLS estimator for the Softmax Experts with $T = 3000$.

Neural Experts

We vary the horizon and confidence level:

$$T \in \{500, 3000\}, \quad A = 3, K = 5, \quad d_x = 50,$$




Figure 4: **Left:** Coverages of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. **Right:** Expected confidence width of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. Simulations are based on $T = 500$ runs.




Figure 5: **Left:** Coverages of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. **Right:** Expected confidence width of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. Simulations are based on $T = 3000$ runs.




Figure 6: **Left:** Histogram of the standardized OLS estimator for the 6-layer Neural-Network Experts with $T = 500$. **Right:** Histogram of the standardized OLS estimator for the 6-layer Neural-Network Experts with $T = 3000$.

6 Proof of Theorems

In this section we prove Theorems 1 and 2. Recall that $S_T = \sum_{t=1}^T c(x_t, a_t)c(x_t, a_t)^\top$ where, the random vector $c(x, a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies

$$\sup_{x,a} \|c(x, a)\|_2 < \infty. \quad (28)$$

By stability (definition (1)) we mean that the sample covariance matrix satisfies the following property.

$$\Sigma_T^{*-1} S_T \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{I} \quad \text{where } \{\Sigma_T^*\} \text{ is a sequence of non-random positive definite matrices.} \quad (29)$$

Let us define the matrix

$$Y_t := c(x_t, a_t)c(x_t, a_t)^\top.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(x_1, a_1, r_1, \dots, x_t, a_t, \ell_t)$, the σ -field generated by all observations up to time t , including x_t , a_t and ℓ_t . Since $x_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{X}$, the conditional expectation

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \mathbb{E}_{x_t} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_t(a \mid x_t) c(x_t, a)c(x_t, a)^\top \right] = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \Sigma_k$$

where the matrices

$$\Sigma_k := \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_k(a \mid x) c(x, a)c(x, a)^\top \right], \quad k = 1, \dots, K \quad (30)$$

are population-level second moments under each expert. In order to simplify notations, throughout we assume $\sigma = 1$.

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We first prove stability holds for the standard OLS estimator, assuming that S_T is invertible, followed by the proof for the modified ridge estimator. Once the stability condition (1) is verified, the asymptotic normality claim (26a) follows directly by invoking Theorem 3 from Lai and Wei (1982) along with an application of Slutsky's theorem.

Part (a): proof of stability condition for S_T (29)

In order to prove the stability of the sample covariance matrix S_T , we need to first prove that the average of the *random* weight vectors $\{w_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ converge to a non-random vector, which we call w_T^* . Concretely,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad (31)$$

for all experts $k \in [K]$.

Proof of weight stability (31):

We begin by recalling that $\tilde{g}_t = \hat{g}_t + \lambda \nabla R(w_t)$. Let $\tilde{R}_\lambda(w) := \lambda R(w) + \langle \bar{g}^*, w \rangle$. If f is any M -strongly convex function, then $f + g$ is also M -strongly convex if g is a linear function (Nesterov (2013)). This result implies that \tilde{R}_λ is λ strongly convex. Now, for any arbitrary $y \in \Delta_\epsilon$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - y \rangle &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{g}^* + \lambda \nabla R(w_t), w_t - y \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbb{E} \langle \bar{g}^*, w_t - y \rangle + \lambda \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla R(w_t), w_t - y \rangle \right) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbb{E} \langle \bar{g}^*, w_t - y \rangle + \lambda \mathbb{E} (R(w_t) - R(y)) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbb{E} [\langle \bar{g}^*, w_t \rangle + \lambda R(w_t)] - \mathbb{E} [\langle \mu, y \rangle + \lambda R(y)] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} [\tilde{R}(w_t) - \tilde{R}(y)] \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{R}(\bar{w}_T) - \tilde{R}(y)] \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{=} \mathbb{E} [D_{\tilde{R}_\lambda}(\bar{w}_T, y) + \langle \nabla \tilde{R}_\lambda(y), \bar{w}_T - y \rangle] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Where $D_{\tilde{R}_\lambda}$ is the Bregman divergence defined in terms of \tilde{R}_λ . The first equality above follows by the unbiasedness of the gradient estimate \tilde{g}_t (Section 2.2). Equation (i) above follows from convexity of R , equation (ii) follows from definition of \tilde{R} and (iii) holds due to convexity of \tilde{R}_λ . Equality (iv) follows from the definition of Bregman divergence. Note that the above discussion holds for any $y \in \Delta_\epsilon$. Let us define w_T^* as follows

$$w_T^* = \arg \min_{w \in \Delta_\epsilon} \tilde{R}_\lambda(w) \quad (33)$$

If we choose $y = w_T^*$ then by applying the first order optimality criteria of equation (33) and Pinsker's inequality we have

$$\langle \nabla \tilde{R}_\lambda(w_T^*), \bar{w}_T - w_T^* \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{and,} \quad D_{\tilde{R}_\lambda}(\bar{w}_T, w_T^*) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\bar{w}_T - w_T^*\|_1^2 \quad (34)$$

From equations (32) and (34), we arrive at the following lower bound:

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_T^* \rangle \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{w}_T - w_T^*\|_1^2 \quad (35)$$

Now, the following lemma provides an upper bound on $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_T^* \rangle$.

Lemma 1. *Under the setup of Theorem 1, we have*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_T^* \rangle \leq 5 \frac{\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}| \log K}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log(K) \log^2(KT)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \sqrt{T}}$$

We prove this lemma in Section 6.2. From equation (35) and Lemma 1 it follows from Jensen's inequality that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{w}_T - w_T^*\|_1] &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_T}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_T^* \rangle} \\ &\leq \sqrt{10 \frac{\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}| \log K}}{\sqrt{T} \lambda_T} + \frac{8\gamma_T^2 \log(K)}{\lambda_T |\mathcal{A}|^2 T \sqrt{T}} \log^2(KT)} \\ &= \sqrt{10 \frac{\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}| \log K}}{\gamma_T} + \frac{8\gamma_T \log(K) \log^2(KT)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 T}} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $|\mathcal{A}|$ and K do not vary with T then for any $\gamma_T \rightarrow \infty$ such that $T/\log^2 T \gg \gamma_T$ it follows that $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \xrightarrow{P} 0$ for all experts $k \in [K]$.

Now we are ready to prove stability of S_T . We first decompose S_T into two parts:

$$S_T = M_T + B_T \quad \text{where} \quad (36a)$$

$$D_t := Y_t - \mathbb{E}[Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}], \quad M_T := \sum_{t=1}^T D_t, \quad \text{and} \quad B_T := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]. \quad (36b)$$

Now, we define

$$\frac{1}{T}\Sigma_T^* := \sum_{k=1}^K w_{T,k}^* \Sigma_k \quad (37)$$

where

$$\Sigma_k := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_X} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_k(a | x) \cdot c(x, a) c(x, a)^\top \right)$$

We show, using Lemma 2 stated below, that

$$\frac{S_T}{T} = \frac{M_T}{T} + \frac{B_T}{T} = \underbrace{\frac{M_T}{T}}_{o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} + \underbrace{\left[\frac{B_T}{T} - \frac{1}{T}\Sigma_T^* \right]}_{o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} + \frac{1}{T}\Sigma_T^* \quad (38)$$

Lemma 2. *Let Σ_k, M_T and B_T be as defined in equations (36a). Suppose that there exists non-random weight vector $w_T^* = (w_{T,1}^*, \dots, w_{T,K}^*)^\top$ such that $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \xrightarrow{P} 0$ for all experts $k \in [K]$. Then we have,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{M_T}{T} \right\|_{op} \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \quad \text{and,} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{B_T}{T} - \sum_{k=1}^K w_{T,k}^* \Sigma_k \right\|_{op} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{w}_T - w_T^*\|]. \quad (39)$$

We prove this Lemma in Appendix C. Let λ^* be the minimum eigenvalue among $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_k)$ for all $k \in [K]$. Note that $\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{T}\Sigma_T^*) \geq \lambda^* > 0$ by Assumption (A3). Hence, the minimum eigenvalue of Σ_T^*/T — which is a convex combination of Σ_k' s — is also lower bounded by λ^* . This fact combined with the decomposition (38) yields

$$\Sigma_T^{*-1} S_T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{I}.$$

.

Part (b) : Proof of stability condition for ridge estimator

In this section we show that if we consider a ridge estimator, with penalty term $\lambda_{rid} \ll \sqrt{T}$, then Theorem 1 holds. Let $R_T := S_T + \lambda_{rid} \mathbf{I}$ and consider the ridge estimator $\hat{\beta}_{rid} := R_T^{-1} S_T \beta^* + R_T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \varepsilon_t$, where $z_t = c(x_t, a_t)$. Our statistic of interest is the following

$$\mathcal{R}_1(T) := \frac{a^\top (\hat{\beta}_{rid} - \beta^*)}{\sqrt{a^\top R_T^{-1} a}} \quad (40)$$

We are interested to show that for the design matrix $R_T = S_T + \lambda_{rid} \mathbf{I}$, there exists a sequence of deterministic, positive definite matrices $\{\tilde{\Sigma}_T\}$ such that

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_T^{-1} R_T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{I} \quad (41)$$

Now, if we choose our penalty term $\lambda_{rid} \ll T$ then for the ridge estimator we have the decomposition of R_T :

$$\frac{R_T}{T} = \underbrace{\frac{M_T}{T}}_{o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} + \underbrace{\left[\frac{B_T}{T} - \frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^* \right]}_{o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} + \underbrace{\frac{\lambda_{rid}}{T} \mathbf{I}}_{o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} + \frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^* \quad (42)$$

Therefore, applying Lemma 2 along with the fact that $\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*) > 0$ shows that property (41) is satisfied by choosing $\tilde{\Sigma}_T = \Sigma_T^*$, where Σ_T^* is as defined in equation (37).

By substituting the value of $\hat{\beta}_{rid}$ in equation (40), we obtain the following decomposition

$$\mathcal{R}_1(T) = \underbrace{\frac{a^\top (R_T^{-1} S_T - \mathbf{I})}{\sqrt{a^\top R_T^{-1} a}} \beta^*}_{\mathcal{T}_1(T)} + \underbrace{\frac{a^\top R_T^{-1}}{\sqrt{a^\top R_T^{-1} a}} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \varepsilon_t}_{\mathcal{T}_2(T)} \quad (43)$$

The term $\mathcal{T}_1(T)$ in equation (43) is the bias induced by the regularization. As $R_T := S_T + \lambda_{rid} \mathbf{I}$ we note that $R_T^{-1} S_T - \mathbf{I} = R_T^{-1} (S_T - R_T)$, which is equal to $-\lambda_{rid} R_T^{-1}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{T}_1(T)$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{T}_1(T) = -\lambda_{rid} \frac{a^\top R_T^{-1}}{\sqrt{a^\top R_T^{-1} a}} \beta^*$$

Let $k_T := \sqrt{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1} a} / \sqrt{a^\top R_T^{-1} a}$ and $\mathcal{M}_T = k_T \times R_T^{-1} \Sigma_T^*$. Then,

$$\mathcal{T}_1(T) = \frac{-\lambda_{rid}}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1}}{\sqrt{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1} a}} \beta^* + \frac{-\lambda_{rid}}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{a^\top [\mathcal{M}_T - \mathbf{I}] (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1}}{\sqrt{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1} a}} \beta^*$$

Therefore, as $\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)$ is uniformly bounded away from zero and $\lambda_{\max}(\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)$ is uniformly bounded above, it follows from stability (equation (41)) that by choosing $\lambda_{rid} \ll \sqrt{T}$, $\mathcal{M}_T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{I}$ and consequently, the bias $\mathcal{T}_1(T)$ converges to 0 in probability, as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Now, for $\mathcal{T}_2(T)$ we have a similar decomposition:

$$\mathcal{T}_2(T) = \underbrace{\frac{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1}}{\sqrt{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1} a}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \varepsilon_t}_{I_1(T)} + \underbrace{\frac{a^\top [\mathcal{M}_T - \mathbf{I}] (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1}}{\sqrt{a^\top (\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^*)^{-1} a}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \varepsilon_t}_{I_2(T)}$$

Now, from central limit theorem for martingale difference sequence (Dvoretzky (1972)), $I_1(T) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. This result, combined with the fact that $\mathcal{M}_T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{I}$ implies $I_2(T)$ converges to 0 in probability. This completes the proof.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We first restrict the comparator w to the truncated simplex. Without loss of generality we assume arm 1 is *among* the optimal arms. Now define

$$w^* = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad w_\epsilon = (1 - (K - 1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon) \in \Delta_\epsilon.$$

To prove this theorem, we shall apply the master equation stated below.

Lemma 3. *For any sequence of contexts $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$ and stochastic losses $\{\ell_t\}_{t=1}^T$, the outputs $\{w_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ produced by Algorithm 3.1 satisfy, for any $y \in \Delta_\epsilon$*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - y \rangle \leq \frac{D_\phi(y, w_1)}{\eta T} + \frac{4\eta}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_t, *}^2 + \lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_t, *}^2 \right\}. \quad (44)$$

By construction, $w^* \in \arg \min_w \langle \bar{g}^*, w \rangle$, and $w_\epsilon \in \Delta_\epsilon$. Consequently, we can apply Lemma 3 with the comparator $w = w_\epsilon$. An application of Holder's inequality and using $\|\bar{g}^*\|_\infty \leq 2$ now yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}(T) &:= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{g}^*, w_t - w^* \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{g}^*, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle + 4TK\epsilon \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle + 4TK\epsilon + 2\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Inequality (i) utilizes the bound $|\langle \bar{g}^*, w^* - w_\epsilon \rangle| \leq \|\bar{g}^*\|_\infty \|w^* - w_\epsilon\|_1 \leq 4K\epsilon$; inequality (ii) utilizes the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{g}^*, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle - \lambda \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla R(w_t), w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle + \lambda |\mathbb{E} \langle \nabla R(w_t), w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle + \lambda \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_\epsilon\|_1] \end{aligned}$$

and the bound $\|\nabla R(w)\|_\infty \leq \log(1/\epsilon)$ for all $w \in \Delta_\epsilon$ along with Holder's inequality. It now remains to bound the inner product term $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle$ using Lemma 3. This result is provided by Lemma 1 in the proof of the stability property of S_T . For the sake of completeness, we state the lemma below.

Lemma. *Under the setup of Theorem 1, we have*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_T^* \rangle \leq 5 \frac{\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}| \log K}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log(K) \log^2(KT)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \sqrt{T}}$$

The proof of Lemma 1 is as follows. Invoking Lemma 3 with $y = w_\epsilon$ and setting $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log K}{|\mathcal{A}|T}}$, $\lambda = \frac{\gamma_T}{\sqrt{T}}$, and $w_1 = (1/K, \dots, 1/K)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle &\leq \frac{D_\phi(w_\epsilon, w_1)}{\eta} + 4\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_{t,*}}^2 + \lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_{t,*}}^2 \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sqrt{T|\mathcal{A}| \log K} + \frac{4\sqrt{\log K}}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}|T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_{t,*}}^2 + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log(K)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 T^{3/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_{t,*}}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sqrt{T|\mathcal{A}| \log K} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log(K)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \sqrt{T}} \log^2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) + \frac{4\sqrt{\log K}}{\sqrt{T|\mathcal{A}|}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_{t,*}}^2 \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (i) above utilizes $D(w, w_1) \leq \log K$ for all $w \in \Delta_K$. This claim holds because

$$D(w, w_1) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \log \left(\frac{w_k}{w_{1,k}} \right) \leq \log K \sum_{k=1}^K w_k = \log K$$

Inequality (ii) uses that for any $w \in \Delta_\epsilon$

$$\|\nabla R(w)\|_{w,*}^2 := \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \log^2 \left(\frac{w_k}{\epsilon} \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \log^2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) = \log^2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right).$$

It now remains to bound the delicate term $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_{t,*}}^2$.

Lemma 4. *Under the setup of Theorem 1 we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_{t,*}}^2 \leq |\mathcal{A}|. \tag{47}$$

The proof of Lemma 4 utilizes the property of the local norm $\|\cdot\|_{w_{t,*}}$ and the specific form of the gradient estimate \hat{g}_t from (17). The complete proof is provided in Appendix C. Now, by substituting equation (47) and $\epsilon = 1/KT$ in equation (46) we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{g}_t, w_t - w_\epsilon \rangle \leq 5\sqrt{T|\mathcal{A}| \log K} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log(K)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \sqrt{T}} \log^2(KT)$$

Combining bounds (45), (46) and (47) we have

$$\text{Regret}(T) \leq 5\sqrt{T|\mathcal{A}| \log K} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log(K)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \sqrt{T}} \log^2(1/\epsilon) + 4TK\epsilon + 2\lambda T \log(1/\epsilon)$$

Finally, substituting $\epsilon = \frac{1}{KT}$, $\lambda = \frac{\gamma_T}{\sqrt{T}}$ and using $T \geq 4$ yields

$$\text{Regret}(T) \leq 8\sqrt{T|\mathcal{A}| \log K} + \gamma_T \log(KT) \sqrt{T} + \frac{4\gamma_T^2 \log^3(KT)}{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \sqrt{T}}$$

7 Conclusion

We studied statistical inference in linear contextual bandits under adaptive data collection, with a focus on the validity of classical Wald-type confidence intervals. By introducing a penalized variant of the EXP4 algorithm, we demonstrated that it is possible to simultaneously enforce the Lai–Wei stability condition and achieve regret guarantees that are minimax optimal up to logarithmic factors. As a consequence, ordinary least-squares estimators satisfy a central limit theorem, and Wald confidence intervals for linear functionals are asymptotically valid without incurring the $\sqrt{d \log T}$ price of adaptivity. Together, these results establish that stability and statistical efficiency are not fundamentally incompatible in contextual bandit problems, and that careful algorithmic design can recover classical inferential guarantees even under adaptive sampling.

Several directions remain open for future work. It would be of interest to extend the present analysis to settings with growing feature dimension or fully adaptive contexts. Understanding whether analogous stability–regret tradeoffs can be achieved remains an important and challenging question.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant DMS-2311304 to Koulik Khamaru.

References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- Jacob D Abernethy, Elad Hazan, and Alexander Rakhlin. Competing in the dark: An efficient algorithm for bandit linear optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, number 110, 2009.
- Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, and Gábor Lugosi. Regret in online combinatorial optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):31–45, 2014.
- Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E Schapire. Gambling in a rigged casino: The adversarial multi-armed bandit problem. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th annual foundations of computer science*, pages 322–331. IEEE, 1995.
- Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E Schapire. The nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problem. *SIAM journal on computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002.
- Heinz H Bauschke, Jonathan M Borwein, and Patrick L Combettes. Essential smoothness, essential strict convexity, and legendre functions in banach spaces. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 3(04):615–647, 2001.

- Sébastien Bubeck, Michael Cohen, and Yuanzhi Li. Sparsity, variance and curvature in multi-armed bandits. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 111–127. PMLR, 2018.
- Ningyuan Chen, Xuefeng Gao, and Yi Xiong. Debiasing samples from online learning using bootstrap. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 8514–8533. PMLR, 2022.
- Victor H de la Pena, Michael J Klass, and Tze Leung Lai. Self-normalized processes: exponential inequalities, moment bounds and iterated logarithm laws. 2004.
- Victor H De la Pena, Tze Leung Lai, and Qi-Man Shao. *Self-normalized processes: Limit theory and Statistical Applications*. Springer, 2009.
- Yash Deshpande, Lester Mackey, Vasilis Syrgkanis, and Matt Taddy. Accurate inference for adaptive linear models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1194–1203. PMLR, 2018.
- Yash Deshpande, Adel Javanmard, and Mohammad Mehrabi. Online debiasing for adaptively collected high-dimensional data with applications to time series analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542):1126–1139, 2023.
- David A Dickey and Wayne A Fuller. Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive time series with a unit root. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 74(366a):427–431, 1979.
- John Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(7), 2011.
- Aryeh Dvoretzky. Asymptotic normality for sums of dependent random variables. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 2: Probability Theory*, volume 6, pages 513–536. University of California Press, 1972.
- Lin Fan and Peter W Glynn. The typical behavior of bandit algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05660*, 2022.
- Wei Fan, Kevin Tan, and Yuting Wei. Statistical inference under adaptive sampling with linuch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.00222*, 2025.
- Yingying Fan, Yuxuan Han, Jinchi Lv, Xiaocong Xu, and Zhengyuan Zhou. Precise asymptotics and refined regret of variance-aware ucb. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08843*, 2024.
- Vitor Hadad, David A Hirshberg, Ruohan Zhan, Stefan Wager, and Susan Athey. Confidence intervals for policy evaluation in adaptive experiments. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 118(15):e2014602118, 2021.
- Budhaditya Halder, Shubhayan Pan, and Koulik Khamaru. Stable thompson sampling: Valid inference via variance inflation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23260*, 2025.
- Qiyang Han, Koulik Khamaru, and Cun-Hui Zhang. Ucb algorithms for multi-armed bandits: Precise regret and adaptive inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06126*, 2024.

- Steven R Howard, Aaditya Ramdas, Jon McAuliffe, and Jasjeet Sekhon. Time-uniform chernoff bounds via nonnegative supermartingales. 2020.
- Shinji Ito. Parameter-free multi-armed bandit algorithms with hybrid data-dependent regret bounds. In Mikhail Belkin and Samory Kpotufe, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Fourth Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2552–2583. PMLR, 15–19 Aug 2021.
- Anand Kalvit and Assaf Zeevi. A closer look at the worst-case behavior of multi-armed bandit algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8807–8819, 2021.
- Koulik Khamaru and Cun-Hui Zhang. Inference with the upper confidence bound algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04595*, 2024.
- Koulik Khamaru, Yash Deshpande, Tor Lattimore, Lester Mackey, and Martin J Wainwright. Near-optimal inference in adaptive linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02266*, 2021.
- Wonyoung Kim, Kyungbok Lee, and Myunghee Cho Paik. Double doubly robust thompson sampling for generalized linear contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 8300–8307, 2023.
- Tze Leung Lai and Ching Zong Wei. Least squares estimates in stochastic regression models with applications to identification and control of dynamic systems. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 154–166, 1982.
- Tor Lattimore. A lower bound for linear and kernel regression with adaptive covariates. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2095–2113. PMLR, 2023.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- James Leiner, Robin Dunn, and Aaditya Ramdas. Adaptive off-policy inference for m-estimators under model misspecification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.14218*, 2025.
- Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 661–670, 2010.
- Saeed Masoudian and Yevgeny Seldin. Improved analysis of the tsallis-inf algorithm in stochastically constrained adversarial bandits and stochastic bandits with adversarial corruptions. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3330–3350. PMLR, 2021.
- Yash Nair and Lucas Janson. Randomization tests for adaptively collected data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05365*, 2023.
- Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Xinkun Nie, Xiaoying Tian, Jonathan Taylor, and James Zou. Why adaptively collected data have negative bias and how to correct for it. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1261–1269. PMLR, 2018.

- Samya Praharaj and Koulik Khamaru. On instability of minimax optimal optimism-based bandit algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18750*, 2025.
- Jaehyeok Shin, Aaditya Ramdas, and Alessandro Rinaldo. Are sample means in multi-armed bandits positively or negatively biased? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Jaehyeok Shin, Aaditya Ramdas, and Alessandro Rinaldo. On the bias, risk, and consistency of sample means in multi-armed bandits. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(4): 1278–1300, 2021.
- Sattar Vakili, Jonathan Scarlett, and Tara Javidi. Open problem: Tight online confidence intervals for rkhs elements. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4647–4652. PMLR, 2021.
- Sofia S Villar, Jack Bowden, and James Wason. Multi-armed bandit models for the optimal design of clinical trials: benefits and challenges. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 30(2):199, 2015.
- Ian Waudby-Smith, Lili Wu, Aaditya Ramdas, Nikos Karampatziakis, and Paul Mineiro. Anytime-valid off-policy inference for contextual bandits. *ACM/IMS Journal of Data Science*, 1(3):1–42, 2024.
- Chen-Yu Wei and Haipeng Luo. More adaptive algorithms for adversarial bandits. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 1263–1291. PMLR, 2018.
- Min Xu, Tao Qin, and Tie-Yan Liu. Estimation bias in multi-armed bandit algorithms for search advertising. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013.
- Kelly Zhang, Lucas Janson, and Susan Murphy. Inference for batched bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9818–9829, 2020.
- Kelly W Zhang, Lucas Janson, and Susan A Murphy. Statistical inference after adaptive sampling for longitudinal data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07098*, 2022.
- Julian Zimmert and Yevgeny Seldin. Tsallis-inf: An optimal algorithm for stochastic and adversarial bandits. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(28):1–49, 2021.

A Proof of important results

In this section we provide the proof of Lemma 3.

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3

We use the shorthand $\tilde{g}_t = \hat{g}_t + \lambda \nabla R(w_t)$ as the gradient estimate of the penalized loss function at w_t . We have

$$\nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+) = \nabla \phi(w_t) - \eta \tilde{g}_t \quad (48)$$

We begin by analyzing the quantity $\langle \eta \tilde{g}_t, w_t - y \rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \eta \tilde{g}_t, w_t - y \rangle &= \langle \nabla \phi(w_t) - \nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+), w_t - y \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} D_\phi(y, w_t) + D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+) - D_\phi(y, w_{t+1}^+) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} D_\phi(y, w_t) + D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+) - D_\phi(y, w_{t+1}) - D_\phi(w_{t+1}, w_{t+1}^+) \\ &\leq D_\phi(y, w_t) - D_\phi(y, w_{t+1}) + D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+) \end{aligned}$$

Here, equality (i) follows from the Bregman 3-point Lemma 6, and inequality (ii) utilizes Lemma 7 which ensures $D_\phi(y, w_{t+1}^+) \geq D_\phi(y, w_{t+1}) + D_\phi(w_{t+1}, w_{t+1}^+)$. Next, we bound $D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+)$, for which we require the following lemma (Lemma 7.3, Bauschke et al. (2001)):

Lemma 5. *For our choice of ϕ the following result holds for any $x, y \in \Delta_\epsilon$*

$$D_\phi(x, y) = D_{\phi^*}(\nabla \phi(y), \nabla \phi(x))$$

where ϕ^* is the Fenchel dual of ϕ .

From Lemma 5 and the definition of Bregman divergence we have,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+) &= D_{\phi^*}(\nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+), \nabla \phi(w_t)) \\ &= \phi^*(\nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+)) - \phi^*(\nabla \phi(w_t)) - \langle \nabla \phi^*(\nabla \phi(w_t)), \nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+) - \nabla \phi(w_t) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Furthermore, the coordinate-wise positivity of \tilde{g}_t in (48) yields $\nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+) \leq \nabla \phi(w_t)$. Hence, by applying the second order Taylor expansion in equation (49), we have that for an intermediate point $z_t = \delta \nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+) + (1 - \delta) \nabla \phi(w_t)$,

$$D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+) = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+) - \nabla \phi(w_t))^T [\nabla^2 \phi^*(z_t)] (\nabla \phi(w_{t+1}^+) - \nabla \phi(w_t))$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\phi^*(y) := \sup_{x \in R_{>0}^d} \{\langle y, x \rangle - \phi(x)\} = \sum_{i=1}^d \exp\{y_i\}$ is the dual map corresponding to ϕ . Note that $\nabla^2 \phi^*(y) = \text{Diag}(\exp\{y_1\}, \dots, \exp\{y_d\})$. By combining this identity with the fact that $z_t \leq \nabla \phi(w_t)$ coordinate-wise we get,

$$\nabla^2 \phi^*(z_t) \preceq \nabla^2 \phi^*(\nabla \phi(w_t)) = \nabla^2 \phi^*(\log w_t) = \text{Diag}(w_1, \dots, w_d)$$

As $\|z_t\|_\infty \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\phi(w_t, w_{t+1}^+) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla\phi(w_t) - \nabla\phi(w_{t+1}^+)\|_{w_t, *}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|\eta\hat{g}_t + \eta\lambda\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_t, *}^2 \\
&\leq \eta^2 \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_t, *}^2 + \eta^2\lambda^2 \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_t, *}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Overall, we arrive at

$$\langle \eta\hat{g}_t, w_t - y \rangle \leq [D_\phi(y, w_t) - D_\phi(y, w_{t+1})] + \eta^2 \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_t, *}^2 + \eta^2\lambda^2 \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_t, *}^2 \quad (50)$$

On taking full-expectation, the left hand side is bounded below by $\eta\mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(y)]$. Taking the average over $t = 1$ to T and using the fact that f is convex yields

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{w}_T) - f(w_{\epsilon, \lambda}^*)] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}D_\phi(w_{\epsilon, \lambda}^*, w_1)}{T} + \frac{4}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \eta^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_t, *}^2 + \eta^2\lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla R(w_t)\|_{w_t, *}^2 \right\}$$

This completes the proof.

B Numerical Experiments for Ridge Estimator

In this section we evaluate the empirical behavior of the proposed *penalized-EXP4* algorithm in a stochastic contextual bandit environment for the modified ridge estimator.

Model and Data Generation

The loss model follows a block-sparse linear structure

$$\ell_t = \langle x_t, \theta_{a_t} \rangle + \varepsilon_t,$$

where $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{Unif}(-0.1, 0.1)$ and $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ is a normalized Gaussian context vector with $\|x_t\|_2 \leq 1$. Each arm $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ possesses an unknown parameter $\theta_a \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, and the global coefficient vector

$$\beta^* = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_A) \in \mathbb{R}^{Ad_x}$$

is normalized to satisfy $\|\beta^*\|_2 \leq 1$. The learner never observes θ_a ; instead, only bandit feedback ℓ_t is revealed. We encode actions through a sparse block feature map

$$c(x, a) = (0, \dots, x, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{Ad_x},$$

Let $R_T = S_T + \lambda_{rid}\mathbf{I}$, where S_T is the sample covariance matrix. Here we consider the ridge estimator

$$\hat{\beta}_{rid} := R_T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T c(x_t, a_t) \ell_t$$

We draw a random unit direction $a \in \mathbb{R}^{Ad_x}$ and for each confidence level $\alpha \in [0.20, 0.01]$, check whether the true parameter lies inside the interval. Concretely we check if the target parameter $a^\top \beta^*$ lies in the interval

$$\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{APS}}(a) := [a^\top \hat{\beta}_{\text{ridge}} - R_T(\alpha) \sqrt{a^\top \mathbf{V}_T^{-1} a}, a^\top \hat{\beta}_{\text{ridge}} + R_T(\alpha) \sqrt{a^\top \mathbf{V}_T^{-1} a}],$$

where $R_T(\alpha)$ is from (3) with $S = 1$. Wald coverage is measured analogously using the confidence interval $\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a)$ similar to (4),

$$\mathcal{I}_T^{\text{Wald}}(a) := \left[a^\top \hat{\beta}_{rid} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{a^\top R_T^{-1} a} \right], \quad (51)$$

with $\hat{\sigma}$ as the sample standard deviation estimate (Lai and Wei, 1982, Lemma 3). For each $T \in \{500, 3000\}$, we report empirical coverage of $\mathcal{I}^{\text{APS}}(a)$ vs $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}(a)$, and their average width.

Algorithmic Configuration

We consider the same simulation environment with 6 layer neural network based experts as considered in Section 5. The experts now form neural policies with a six-layer ReLU architecture. The expert policy is a six-layer neural network given by

$$x \longrightarrow h_1 \longrightarrow h_2 \longrightarrow h_3 \longrightarrow h_4 \longrightarrow h_5 \longrightarrow h_6 \longrightarrow \text{softmax}(\text{logits}),$$

where the hidden layers satisfy

$$h_i = \text{ReLU}(W_i h_{i-1} + b_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, 6,$$

with $h_0 = x$. The entries of the weight matrices W_i are i.i.d. draws from $\mathcal{N}(0, 12)$ distribution. The resulting expert policy is

$$\pi(a \mid x) = \frac{\exp(\text{logits}_a)}{\sum_{a'=1}^A \exp(\text{logits}_{a'})}.$$

In our experiments we set $A = 3$ and $K = 5$ and $d_x = 50$. At the end of horizon T , we compute the ridge estimator

$$\hat{\beta}_{rid} = (S_T + \lambda_{rid} I)^{-1} b_T, \quad S_T = \sum_{t=1}^T c(x_t, a_t) c(x_t, a_t)^\top, \quad b_T = \sum_{t=1}^T c(x_t, a_t) \ell_t.$$

Hyperparameters are selected as

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{KT}, \quad \lambda_{\text{pen}} = \frac{\sqrt{\log T}}{\sqrt{T}}, \quad \eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log K}{|\mathcal{A}|T}}, \quad \lambda_{rid} = \frac{1}{T}$$

unless stated otherwise. For each T , we report:

- Empirical coverage \mathcal{I}^{APS} vs $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$,
- Average width \mathcal{I}^{APS} vs $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$,
- Dependence on nominal confidence level α .

Simulation Plots




Figure 7: **Left:** Coverage of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. **Right:** Expected confidence width of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. Simulations are based on $T = 3000$ runs.




Figure 8: **Left:** Coverage of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. **Right:** Expected confidence width of both \mathcal{I}^{APS} and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{Wald}}$. Simulations are based on $T = 3000$ runs.





Figure 9: **Left:** Histogram of the standardized Ridge estimator for $T = 500$. **Right:** Histogram of the standardized Ridge estimator for $T = 3000$.

C Auxiliary Lemmas

In this section we present some well-known results on Bregman divergence for the sake of completeness, followed by the proofs of Lemma 2 and 4.

Some Results on Bregman Divergence

We begin with two standard identities for Bregman divergences that will be used repeatedly. Let $\phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable, strictly convex function on an open convex set $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^K$. The Bregman divergence generated by ϕ is

$$D_\phi(x, y) = \phi(x) - \phi(y) - \langle \nabla \phi(y), x - y \rangle, \quad x, y \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Lemma 6 (Bregman three-point identity). *For any differentiable and strictly convex function $\phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any $x, x^+, y \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$\langle \nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(x^+), x - y \rangle = D_\phi(y, x) - D_\phi(y, x^+) + D_\phi(x, x^+),$$

where $D_\phi(u, v) = \phi(u) - \phi(v) - \langle \nabla \phi(v), u - v \rangle$ is the Bregman divergence generated by ϕ .

Proof. By the definition of the Bregman divergence,

$$\begin{aligned} & D_\phi(y, x) - D_\phi(y, x^+) + D_\phi(x, x^+) \\ &= (\phi(y) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle) - (\phi(y) - \phi(x^+) - \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), y - x^+ \rangle) \\ & \quad + (\phi(x) - \phi(x^+) - \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), x - x^+ \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

The $\phi(\cdot)$ terms cancel, giving

$$-\langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), y - x^+ \rangle - \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), x - x^+ \rangle.$$

Since $y - x^+ = (y - x) + (x - x^+)$, the last two inner products combine to $\langle \nabla \phi(x^+), y - x \rangle$. Thus the entire expression simplifies to

$$\langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle = \langle \nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(x^+), x - y \rangle,$$

which proves the desired identity. □

Definition 2 (Bregman projection). *Let $X \subset \mathcal{D}$ be closed and convex. For $y \in \mathcal{D}$, the (right) Bregman projection of y onto X is*

$$\Pi_X^\phi(y) \in \arg \min_{x \in X} D_\phi(x, y).$$

Lemma 7 (Bregman Pythagorean theorem). *Let $X \subset \mathcal{D}$ be nonempty, closed, and convex, and let $x^+ = \Pi_X^\phi(y)$. Then for all $x \in X$,*

$$D_\phi(x, y) \geq D_\phi(x, x^+) + D_\phi(x^+, y).$$

Proof. By first-order optimality for the convex problem $\min_{x \in X} D_\phi(x, y)$,

$$\langle \nabla_x D_\phi(x, y) \big|_{x=x^+}, x - x^+ \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Since $\nabla_x D_\phi(x, y) = \nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(y)$, we have

$$\langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(y), x - x^+ \rangle \geq 0.$$

Apply Lemma 6 with $(x, y, z) = (x^+, y, x)$ to obtain

$$\langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(y), x - x^+ \rangle = D_\phi(x, x^+) - D_\phi(x, y) + D_\phi(x^+, y).$$

Rearranging yields the stated inequality. \square

Proof of Lemma 2

By construction, (M_T, \mathcal{F}_T) is a mean-zero *matrix-valued martingale*:

$$\mathbb{E}[D_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[M_T \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = M_{t-1}.$$

Because $\|c(x, a)\|$ is uniformly bounded,

$$\|Y_t\|_F^2 \leq d^2 \sup_{x,a} \|c(x, a)\|^4 < \infty.$$

Hence $\mathbb{E}[\|D_t\|_F^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq C$ for some constant $C < \infty$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\|M_T\|_F^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\|D_t\|_F^2 \leq CT.$$

By orthogonality of martingale differences,

$$\mathbb{E}\|M_T\|_F^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\|D_t\|_F^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\|D_t\|_F^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] \leq CT.$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{M_T}{T} \right\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E}\|M_T\|_F^2 \leq \frac{C}{T} \rightarrow 0, \quad (52)$$

which shows $M_T/T \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 and hence in probability. Note that in the above equation we have considered the Frobenius norm. However, as all finite dimensional norms are equivalent, $M_T/T \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ with respect to the operator norm as well. From our assumption it follows that there exists non-random weight vector w_T^* such that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (53)$$

for all experts $i \in [K]$. Now we observe that,

$$\frac{B_T}{T} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} \right) \Sigma_k$$

As all the elements of Σ_k are *uniformly* bounded, we have the following string of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{B_T}{T} - \frac{1}{T} \Sigma_T^* \right\|_{op} &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \right) \Sigma_k \right\|_{op} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \right| \|\Sigma_k\|_{op} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{t,k} - w_{T,k}^* \right| = \|\bar{w}_T - w_T^*\|_1 \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Therefore, our proof is complete.

Proof of Lemma 4

Recall that

$$\hat{g}_{t,k} = \ell_t \frac{\pi_k(a_t \mid x_t)}{Q_t(a_t \mid x_t)}, \quad Q_t(a \mid x_t) = \sum_{j=1}^K w_{t,j} \pi_j(a \mid x_t),$$

and assume $|\ell_t| \leq 1$ almost surely. By definition of the local dual norm,

$$\|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_t,*}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \hat{g}_{t,k}^2 = \ell_t^2 \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \frac{\pi_k^2(a_t \mid x_t)}{Q_t^2(a_t \mid x_t)}.$$

Conditioning on x_t and summing over $a_t \sim Q_t(\cdot \mid x_t)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}_t\|_{w_t,*}^2 \mid x_t] &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_t(a \mid x_t) \left\{ \ell_t^2 \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \frac{\pi_k^2(a \mid x_t)}{Q_t^2(a \mid x_t)} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \ell_t^2 \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \frac{\pi_k^2(a \mid x_t)}{Q_t(a \mid x_t)} \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \ell_t^2 \sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \frac{\pi_k(a \mid x_t) \max_j \pi_j(a \mid x_t)}{Q_t(a \mid x_t)} \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \ell_t^2 \max_j \pi_j(a \mid x_t) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K w_{t,k} \pi_k(a \mid x_t)}{Q_t(a \mid x_t)} \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \ell_t^2 \max_j \pi_j(a \mid x_t) \leq |\mathcal{A}| \max_{x,a} \ell_t^2 \leq |\mathcal{A}|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $Q_t(a \mid x_t) = \sum_k w_{t,k} \pi_k(a \mid x_t)$ in the third line, and $\max_{x,a} \ell_t^2 \leq 1$ in the last inequality. This completes the proof.